



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

his and Poe's conceptions of brevity are quite divergent. In his idea of limiting the number of persons and the duration of the action in the *novelle* Spielhagen has precedent enough in Germany, both in practice and in theory,<sup>25</sup> without having to turn to Poe for guidance. He names only one of his predecessors in this branch of criticism, Goethe, and only with many reservations can it be asserted that Goethe's "eine sich ereignete unerhörte Begebenheit" and Poe's "totality of effect" or "unity of impression" tend to the same end, that is to say, toward a single theme which is to form the foundation of the structure. Had his theory owed anything to Poe, a man of Spielhagen's frankness would have been the first to acknowledge his debt, but in view of his extremely disparaging mention of Poe both as short-story writer and as critic, in view of the utter dissimilarity of the two authors both in choice of subject and in treatment, it seems hardly possible to regard Spielhagen as "the first exponent in Germany of the Poe doctrine of the tale, and likewise the medium of transmission of this doctrine to German soil."

McBURN EY MITCHELL.

*Brown University.*

## ORIGIN AND FORCE OF THE SPLIT INFINITIV

The late Fitzedward Hall publisht in 1882 in the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. III, pp. 17-24, the first scientific history of the split infinitiv. This short but vigorous articl laid bare the glaring ignorance of the opponents of the construction and placed the whole question in an entirely different light. Since then much has been ritten on this subject by English, American, and German scholars. Up to the present the attention has been chiefly directed to the earliest appearance of this construction and its later gradually increasing

spredd. The factors that hav braut it into life hav been discust briefly by a number of scholars, but as yet no theory has become establisht. The riter desires here to present an explanation which he beliefs accounts fully for its origin.

Those who hav heretofore assayd an explanation seek, on the one hand, the cause in a desire for a more perfect expression of thaut or a smooother rythmic flow, or, on the other hand, see only formal grammatical factors involvd. The former ground is assumed by Professor Lounsbury in *Harper's Magazine* for April, 1904, p. 734. He takes for study the following sentence from Lord Macaulay's essay on Lord Holland: "In order *to fully* appreciate the character of Lord Holland, it is necessary to go back into the history of his family." Here in the revision of 1843 the adverb *fully* stands after the *to*, while in the original form of 1841 the adverb precedes *to* in accordance with Macaulay's usual practis of placing the adverb before *to*: "in order *fully to* appreciate," etc.

Professor Lounsbury remarks upon the motiv for this change of word-order: "He (Lord Macaulay) must hav believd that in thus departing from his usual practis he had secured the additional emfasis for which he was striving." It seems strange to the riter that Professor Lounsbury, who has usually such a keen feeling for historical development in English could make such a blunder. If Lord Macaulay had desired "additional emfasis" he would hav placed the adverb *after* the infinitiv. Since the fourteenth century ther has developpt sharp differentiation of force here. In oldest English the infinitiv stood at the end of the sentence preceded by its modifiers. Later ther developpt a tendency to place the *important* modifiers after the infinitiv. Gradually all the important modifiers wer removed to the position after the infinitiv except adverbs that wer either weakly strest, or, as in the case of Lord Macaulay's exampl, only moderatly strest.

Lookt at historically, this new rule of placing the weakly strest or moderatly strest adverb before the infinitiv and the strongly strest adverb after it is the resultant of two forces. Accord-

<sup>25</sup> Compare, e. g., Paul Heyse, *Deutscher Novellenschatz*, Bd. I, Einleitung. München, o. J. (1871).

ing to older usage the adverb preceded the infinitiv, but according to later usage the more important elements crowded out the infinitiv and gained the emphatic final position, leaving the more weakly accented adverbs in their old historic position before the infinitiv. On account of the marked advantages of this new word-order it is one of the most momentous changes that have taken place in historic times, especially as it later influences the word-order in the principal clause, as we shall see below. A few illustrations of this word-order for the infinitiv clause may be helpful: "I hope to *immediately* effect a cure," or with more emphasis: to effect a cure *immediately*. Among the weakly stressed adverbs, or sentence adverbs, *i. e.*, adverbs that modify not the verb but the whole sentence or clause: "He seems to *actually* imagine himself learned." Closely related to such words are adverbs of degree: "The gain at this point is sufficient *to more than* offset the losses elsewhere." "He doesn't intend *to half* try." "The head seemed to *almost* part company with the body." In a number of such expressions the adverb cannot be placed after the infinitiv, while others under strong stress naturally take this position: "I intend to *entirely* give up this habit," or with stronger emphasis: "to give up this habit *entirely*."

These rules for the position of the adverb in infinitiv clauses which were already fairly well fixed in the fourteenth century began later to spread to the simple tenses, where the same usage had developed independently, but was rather uncommon as the tendency to place the adverb after the verb usually prevailed. Thus Chaucer's "I *wonder greatly*" became "I *greatly wonder*" under the influence of "Do you *greatly wonder*?" "I do *greatly wonder*," etc., and similarly "I *have greatly wondered*," etc., where the auxiliary in all cases merely denotes tense or modal function and the real verbal meaning lies in the infinitiv or participial form. As the weakly stressed adverb in all cases stands *before* the verbal form that contains the verbal meaning it gradually became natural for it to seek the position before the simple tenses. On the other hand, the *strongly* stressed adverb now stands *after* the infinitiv,

participial, or a simple tense, so that we have at last attained to a uniform law for the position of adverbs in all kinds of clauses, namely that the *weakly or moderately stressed adverb precedes and the strongly stressed adverb follows the verbal form that contains the verbal meaning*. In the light of these examples and this law it is perfectly clear that Lord Macaulay did not in his revision change the position of the adverb for the purpose of additional stress. He merely desired to bring *to* into closer relation to *in order*, for we today feel *in order to* as an inseparable expression which is used to introduce an infinitiv clause of purpose.

It is thus quite evident that formal grammatical factors are involved in the development of this construction. Professor Jespersen, in his *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 209, 1st ed., has essayed the following explanation: "Another recent innovation is the use of *to* as what might be called a pro-infinitiv instead of the clumsy *to do so*: 'Will you play?' 'Yes, I intend to.' 'I am going to.' This is one among several indications that the linguistic instinct now takes *to* to belong to the preceding verb rather than to the infinitiv, a fact which explains the phenomenon usually misnamed 'the split infinitiv.'"

This theory is destroyed by the fact that it does not explain such cases as "To almost succeed is not enough." Here *to* does not belong to any preceding word. Even in Old English the prepositional infinitiv could be used as the subject of a verb, so that *to* even in this early period had become firmly attached to the infinitiv quite independent of any governing word. In the earliest examples of the split infinitiv we of course find the *to* either dependent upon some preceding word or quite independent of such a word, for this feature does not enter into the case as a determining factor. We must look for some other explanation.

The development of the split infinitiv is evidently closely connected with the development of the word-order in infinitiv clauses. The oldest examples known to the writer are found in *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight* (about 1320-30 A. D.): "He (Arthur) louied þe lasse (*the less*) aȝer (either) *to lenge lye*, or *to*

*longe sitte*" (ll. 37-8). "Bot to take þe ton-ayle to my-self, to trwluf expoun," etc. (ib. l. 1540) *but to undertake the task to expound true-love*. In the very nature of things it will not be possibl to find exampls much older, for in the older period the infinitiv was inclined to stand at or near the end of the clause after its modifiers. In the fourteenth century when the infinitiv began to become establisht at the beginning of the clause before its modifiers the possibility of the split infinitiv began. In the first of the two exampls the *to* is separated from the infinitiv by an adverb, in the second exampl by the object. The second case is very rare, for the object at this time had almost become establisht in the position *after* the infinitiv. The requirements of the alliterativ verse probably explain this word-order here, but as this arrangement is absolutely unknown in older alliterativ poetry it is perfectly evident that only a new conception of the infinitiv clause has renderd this word-order here possibl. As the object soon became fixt in the position after the infinitiv the weakly or moderately strest adverb alone could stand between the *to* and the infinitiv. The split infinitiv made a good beginning in *Sir Gawayne*, but in this same poem the older order of placing the weakly or moderately strest adverb *before* the *to* is also employd, and this usage remains the more common of the two thruout the following centuries: "þe lorde . . . cumaundes to delyuer hym a leude (page), hym *logly to serue*" (ll. 850-1).

In reading a large number of books of different centuries, it became quite clear to the riter that the adverb here in both positions, *i. e.*, before and after the infinitiv, is quite rare, as often only a few exampls could be found in a whole treatis. The comparativ infrequency of the adverb here helpt materially to facilitate the development of the split infinitiv. Wherever there was no adverb the *to* introduced the infinitiv clause. Thus the *to* gradually became establisht in the *first* place in the infinitiv clause, just as *that* became establisht in the first place in similar clauses. There is in the history of the language a close relation between that-clauses and infinitiv clauses. A markt difference between the language of the thir-

teenth century and that of the following periods is the gradual replacement of the *that*-clause by the infinitiv construction: "Siec *ðat tu haue* pais ageanes gode" ("*Vices and Virtues*," p. 59, A. D. 1200), now "Seek *to hav* peace with God."

Today the infinitiv is a great favorit and we prefer it to a *that*-clause wherever it is possibl, *i. e.*, wher its subject is the same as that of the principal verb: "I firmly intend *to always* do the right thing," but "I firmly intend *that* they shal always do the right thing." The old historic order "*always to do* the right thing" often as here yields to the newer order "*to always do* the right thing" because there is a growing tendency to giv the infinitiv clause a fixt and definit form introduced by *to*. The *to* is not felt as a part of the infinitiv but as an introduction to the infinitiv clause. If the infinitiv is modified by an adverb the adverb is now often placed directly before the infinitiv itself as the *to* is not felt as belonging to the infinitiv so much as to the whole clause. In oldest English the *to* before the infinitiv was a preposition with the full force and meaning of a preposition as found elsewhere before nouns, but alrely in the course of Old English it had begun to lose its original meaning and became more and more the mere formal sign of the infinitiv. Thus in looking at the split infinitiv from a strict historical and linguistic point of view it is a clear and neat construction that has slowly developept out of a wide-spredd desire to find a more accurat formal grammatical expression for our changed conception of the infinitiv clause.

A large number of scholars hav cald attention to the fact that the position of the adverb after *to* sometimes makes the thaut perfectly clear, while the adverb might be braut into relation with the preceding verb if it stands before *to*: "I endeavord *strongly* to influence him." Here "*strongly*" may in the ritten language modify either the verb "endeavord" or the infinitiv "influence." In the spoken language a pause after the verb would indicate the latter relation, a pause after the adverb the former relation. In the fourteenth century the ambiguity here was so markt in negativ sentences

that the split infinitiv was not infrequently employd to make the thaut clear: "Of whiche is Ymeneus and Alisaundre, whiche Y bitook to Sathanas, that thei lerne *to not* blasfeme" (1 Tim. 1.20, John Purvey, A. D. 1388) "that they may learn *not to* blaspheme" (King James version).

The authors of King James version did not employ the split infinitiv here as the conditions of the language had undergone a decided change at this point. In the fourteenth century the negativ stood after the simpl form of the verb just before the infinitiv clause so that the thaut became perfectly ambiguous if the negativ belonged to the infinitiv and was placed before the *to*. To avoid this difficulty the fourteenth century riters not infrequently made use of the split infinitiv. Later the subjunctiv of the simpl verb and the negative form of both moods were replaced by periphrastic forms, as "may not learn," "did not learn," so that ther was no longer any necessity for using the split infinitiv, and this new form disappeared. Now we must not conclude that the ambiguity in this negativ construction cald into being the new form. The mind simply recognized here the advantage of the new form which had alre dy been created. The oldest known exampls, from *Sir Gawayne* given above, show conclusivly that the split infinitiv originally had nothing to do with the question of ambiguity. Similarly the mind now recognizes the advantage of this new form to avoid the clashing of two words with the same ending: "A country priest would be *likely to closely* resembl Chaucer's ideal parson" rather than "*likely closely* to resembl," etc. There is, however, a great difference in these two cases. In this last exampl we would still prefer the split infinitiv even if another word were substituted for *closely*: "A country priest would be likely *to much* resembl," etc., for this construction is now a favorit. On the other hand, as soon as the new tense and mood forms removed the ambiguity in the negativ construction as found in the fourteenth century the older form of placing *not* before *to* at once asserted itself again with its former power and has in general remaind firm ever since: "I promis you *not to*

go out." Of all adverbs "not" is the most tenacious of this old historic position and has not as yet joined the general movement toward the position after the *to*. The reason seems to be that it has formed a fixt compound with *to* and cannot be separated. Thus we say, "He did it, as he promist *to*," but in negativ form: "He did it, but he promist *not to*."

This set form has also influenst the negativ form of *in order to*. Formerly the adverb could be inserted between *order* and *to*, but as indicated by Lord Macaulay's revision described above it is now more natural to regard the form *in order to* as inseparabl and we thus place the adverb after the compound form. The older order of things, however, still prevails in the negativ form of statement: "I refraind from this course in order *not to* hurt his feelings." The firmly fixt type *not to*, found so often elsewhere has here interrupted the natural development.

Aside from this negativ type the new form with the adverb after *to* is now gaining ground. As this new form givs more accurat formal expression to our modern feeling and has been stedily gaining ground, it will probably in due time become establisht to the exclusion of the other form. New grammatical conceptions usually in the course of time find a new grammatical form and the old form passes away. Ther ar many illustrations of this creation of form for an idea. Originally the infinitiv and the gerund wer mere verbal nouns. In the course of the historic period they hav in English developpt grammatical forms for tense and voice to an extent unknown in the closely related German. In "There is much *to be done*" English in fashioning a passiv form to suit the idea is richer than German in "Es ist viel *zu tun*." How poor older English seems to us when we read: "A shootynge Gloue is chieflie for to saue a mannes fyngers from *huntinge*" (Roger Ascham's *Toxophilus*, A. D. 1545), now "being hurt." The few defenders of lost causes who still claim that "the house is *building*" is more forcibl than "the house is *being built*" are not brave enuf to be consistent and say with Bolingbroke "the crime which was *committing*" insted of our expressiv recent for-

mation *being committed*. Those who love life glory in the constructiv forces that hav long been at work in English, but littl grammarians who hav no conception of creativ linguistic instinct and see in all change a corruption hav always raised their voices against these beneficent forces and ar stil crying out against the split infinitiv and similar creations, but the deep-seated linguistic processes go quietly on establishing themselves in those countless minds that operate not by artificial regulations but in accordance with simpl natural laws.

GEORGE O. CURME.

*Northwestern University.*

## PROSE FICTION IN ENGLAND BEFORE RICHARDSON

*A List of English Tales and Prose Romances printed before 1740*, by ARUNDELL ESDAILE. London, Printed for the Bibliographical Society, 1912. xxxv + 329 pp.

Students of sixteenth and seventeenth century English literature are in debt to the Bibliographical Society for not a few valuable tools of research. One has only to recall Mr. Greg's lists of plays and masques,<sup>1</sup> the Society's finding-lists of early printed books,<sup>2</sup> and Mr. Duff's, Mr. McKerrow's and Mr. Plomer's dictionaries of printers and booksellers,<sup>3</sup> to realize some of the services which this very active group of scholars has performed, not merely for bibliography in the narrower sense, but for literary history as

well. And now Mr. Esdaile has given us what will doubtless prove one of the most useful, because one of the most needed, of all the Society's publications—a catalogue of the works of prose fiction printed in England before 1740.

His conception of his task was a commendably ambitious one. He proposed to include in his list not only all early English tales and romances, but also all known and discoverable editions of each one of them. Such an ideal necessarily involved him in prolonged research among the treasures of the great English public libraries—the Museum, the Bodleian, the University Library, Cambridge—as well as of many catalogued and accessible private libraries, such as the Bridgwater and the Huth collections. But he also had recourse for information regarding books no longer extant, not only to such obvious sources as the *Stationers' Registers* and the *Term Catalogues*, but also to a group of documents much less frequently utilized than they—the advertisements of seventeenth century publishers.<sup>4</sup> It is to be regretted

<sup>4</sup> He has not, however, extracted from them all the substance which they contain. The following list of "addenda" is based in large part, though not exclusively, upon publishers' advertisements not used, or incompletely used, by Mr. Esdaile: p. 17, *The Famous History of the Learned Fryer Bacon*, advertised by J. Deacon in *The Gallant History of Bevis of Southampton* (B.M., 837. e. 4); p. 39, *The History of the Gentle-Craft*, advertised by W. Thackeray in *The Famous and Renowned History of Sir Bevis of Southampton*, 1689 (B.M., 1077. g. 35/3); p. 40, *The Shoee-makers Glory*, advertised by Sarah Bates in *Guy of Warwick* (B.M., 12403. d. 1); p. 42, *Jack of Newbery*, advertised by W. Thackeray in *The Famous and Renowned History of Sir Bevis of Southampton*, 1689; p. 46, *The History of Dr. Faustus*, advertised by J. Deacon in *The Gallant History of Bevis of Southampton*; p. 49, *Montillion*, a copy in the stock of John Foster, a York bookseller, 1616 (Davies, *A Memoir of the York Press*, p. 363); p. 51, *Ornatus and Artesia*, advertised by J. Deacon and W. Thackeray in *The Famous and Renowned History of Sir Bevis of Southampton*, 1689; p. 61, *Gesta Romanorum*, advertised by G. Conyers in *Dorastus and Faunia*, 1688 (B.M., 12403. aa. 22); p. 83, *The History of the Seven Champions*, advertised by J. Deacon in *The Famous and Renowned History of Sir Bevis of Southampton*, 1689; *ibid.*, *Seven Champions*, advertised by Woodgate and Brooks in *The Unfortunate Lovers* (B.M., 12410. aa.

<sup>1</sup> *A List of English Plays written before 1643 and printed before 1700*. London, 1900; *A List of Masques, Pageants, &c.* London, 1902.

<sup>2</sup> *Hand-lists of English Printers, 1501-1556*. London, 1895-1905.

<sup>3</sup> *A Century of the English Book-trade . . . 1457 to . . . 1557*. By E. Gordon Duff. London, 1905; *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland . . . , 1557-1640*. General editor: R. B. McKerrow. London, 1910; *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*. By Henry R. Plomer. London, 1907.